

32

## REMARKS

33           In the parent case of this RCE case, the Examiner made a final rejection  
34           of claims 2-9, 11 and 14 on grounds that claims 2-9, 11 and 14 fail to comply with  
35           the description requirement. The Examiner bases this rejection on the fact that  
36           the original disclosure does not allegedly teach collocation of the firewall device  
37           and the wireless data terminal. Only claims amended claim 11 and new claim  
38           14 recite the collocation limitation, and claims 2-9 depend from claim 11, but do  
39           not recite this limitation themselves.

40           In response to this rejection, claims 2-9 have not been amended, but  
41           claims 11 and 14 have been amended. Claim 11 has been amended to recite  
42           that the firewall device (more specifically, the wireless communication interface  
43           module thereof) is directly connected to the wireless communication device  
44           (which previously was recited to be collocated) such that a direct communication  
45           is established between the firewall device and the remote wireless terminal  
46           without accessing a full management station managing a plurality of firewalls.

47           Win et al. fails to teach a network management equipment comprising a  
48           wireless communication device directly connected to a firewall device to establish  
49           direct communication between the firewall device and a remote wireless terminal  
50           and a limited management interface without accessing a full management station  
51           managing a plurality of firewalls as recited in claims 11 and 14.

52           Win et al. fails to disclose a firewall device comprising a security  
53           application and a full management interface which comprises mechanisms for  
54           conducting management operations for said network security application of the  
55           firewall device over a secure data connection from a full management station  
56           managing a plurality of firewall devices.

57                   Win also fails to teach a firewall device comprising a limited management  
58                   user interface for conducting limited number of management operations of the full  
59                   management user interface for the network security application of the firewall  
60                   device.

61                   Win further fails to teach that a firewall device comprising a wireless  
62                   communication interface module is directly connected to a wireless  
63                   communication device through which the wireless remote connection is  
64                   established.

65                   As noted previously, Win discloses a method for secure user access to  
66                   authorized web resources, based upon the user's role in the organization that  
67                   controls the web resources. The access is provided and managed by an access  
68                   server and a registry server that manages access to administration information  
69                   about user resources and roles of the users.

70                   Win et al. does not disclose management of a firewall.

71                   In section 7 of the Final Action, the Examiner alleges that Win teaches to  
72                   the management of any node in the network architecture, including the firewall.

73                   However, the Examiner fails to show where such teaching is made in Win.

74                   According to Win, the access server and a registry server manage and control a  
75                   secure user access to authorized web resources, i.e., web servers. Win does not  
76                   teach a management of any node.

77                   The Examiner admits that Win fails to teach maintaining a limited user  
78                   interface within a managed device, such as a firewall. The Examiner alleges that  
79                   McGrane discloses maintaining a limited user interface within a managed device,  
80                   such as a firewall.

81                   As we have noted before, McGrane relates to totally different technical  
82                   field, namely to an arrangement for controlling domestic entertainment

83           electronics by an infra-red control unit. There would have been no motivation to  
84           apply teachings of McGrane, which relates to domestic entertainment electronics,  
85           to the system of Win et al., which relates to management of access to web  
86           resources.

87           Moreover, even if a person skilled in the art would have considered  
88           McGrane, the skilled person would not have achieved the present invention as  
89           claimed. In McGrane, the IR controller sends IR signals to a centralized control  
90           unit which responds to these IR signals by sending commands to respective ones  
91           of a plurality of controlled devices. Thus, each controlled device has a single  
92           wired control interface to the centralized control unit.

93           If a person skilled in the art had attempted to apply this teaching in Win,  
94           he/she would have controlled the access server and/or registry server by an IR  
95           controller. The skilled person would not have directly controlled the web servers  
96           or any other device in the network.

97           Thus, Win in view of McGrane teaches away from the present invention.

98           Based upon this reasoning, Claims 11 and 14 are not obvious from Win et  
99           al. in view of McGrane.

100           Claims 2 – 9 are dependent upon claim 11, and are therefore also  
101           patentable.

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 12, 2007

  
Ronald Craig Fish  
Reg. No. 28,843  
Tel 408 866 4777

112  
113 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail,  
114 postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents , P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450.  
115 on 7/12/07  
116 (Date of Deposit)



Ronald Craig Fish, President  
Ronald Craig Fish, a Law Corporation

122 Reg. No. 28,843

123